

***North American Numbering Council***

**Meeting Minutes**

**November 28-29, 2000 (Final)**

***I. Time and Place of Meeting.*** The North American Numbering Council held a meeting commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room TW-C305, Washington, DC.

***II. List of Attendees.***

Voting Council Members:

1. Beth Kistner	ALTS
2. Ed Gould	AT&T
3. Wendy Potts	Bell Canada
4. Randy Sanders	Bell South
5. Terry Monroe	CompTel
6. Lori Messing	CTIA
7. Keith McIntosh	CWTA
8. Switzon Wigfall	NARUC
9. Loretta Lynch	NARUC
10. Peter Pescosolido	NARUC
11. Greg Pattenaude	NARUC
12. Nancy Brockway	NARUC
13. Natalie Billingsley	NASUCA
14. Hong Hu	NASUCA
15. Philip McClelland	NASUCA
16. Beth O'Donnell	NCTA
17. James Goldstein	Nextel
18. David Bench	Nortel Networks
19. Trent Boaldin	OPASTCO
20. Courtney Jackson	OUR, Jamaica
21. Harold Salters	PCIA
22. Bill Adair	SBC
23. Ron Havens	Sprint
24. John Hoffman	Sprint PCS
25. Gerry Rosenblatt/David Thompson	TIA
26. Paul Hart	USTA
27. Jim Castagna	Verizon
28. Cathie Capita	VoiceStream
29. Peter Guggina	WorldCom
30. Dawn Lawrence	XO Communications

Special Members (non-voting):

Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS
John Manning	NANPA

Commission Employees:

Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Aaron Goldberger, Alternate DFO

Jeannie Grimes, Network Services Division (NSD), Common Carrier Bureau

Diane Harmon, Deputy Chief, NSD

Aaron Goldberger, NSD

Les Selzer, NSD, CCB

Patrick Forster, Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

**III. *Estimate of Public Attendance.*** Approximately 42 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. *Documents Introduced.***

- (1) Agenda
- (2) September 19-20, 2000 Meeting Minutes (draft)
- (3) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (4) Pending NRUF forms
- (5) NANPA Oversight Working Group
- (6) NANPA Annual Performance Survey – 2000
- (7) Memo to State Regulators and Interested Parties from Chairman Hoffman seeking input on NANPA performance
- (8) Letter to Hon. Frank H. Watson MP, Public Utilities Commission, Bahamas, seeking input on NANPA performance
- (9) NRO Working Group Report
- (10) Letter (with attachment) from NRO Working Group to Chairman Hoffman regarding proposed addendum to Pooling Administrator Requirements Document
- (11) COCUS Requirements Document
- (12) October 17-18, 2000 Meeting Minutes (draft)
- (13) INC Report
- (14) INC Report on UNP
- (15) Toll Free IMG Report
- (16) Comparison of LNP, Pooling, and Toll Free databases
- (17) NIIF Report to NANC on Issue #0173 – Toll Free Record Application Record Guidelines
- (18) Local Number Portability Working Group Report
- (19) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report
- (20) CTIA Minority Opinion regarding 3<sup>rd</sup> Wireline/Wireless Integration Report
- (21) Cost Recovery Working Group Report
- (22) Letter from Chairman Hoffman to Dorothy Attwood, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, regarding 3<sup>rd</sup> Wireline/Wireless Integration Report
- (23) Letter from Chairman Hoffman to Dorothy Attwood, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, requesting an extension until March 30, 2000 to complete toll free administration assignment
- (24) Table of NANC Projects

- (25) CICs IMG Report
- (26) NBANC Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection

**V. *Summary of the Meeting.***

***Opening Remarks.***

**B. *North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report.*** John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council.

Enterprise Services. Representatives of NeuStar met with state commissions to better understand their needs for customized reports. Additional meetings are planned for December to get additional input from state commissions. NANPA expects to complete data on the type of standardized reports and customized reports it will provide to states in late January and will report to the NOWG and the NANC.

Update on NRUF. NANPA is working with industry trade associations to educate carriers on how to complete forms. A meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2000 to review the forms and revisions proposed by NANPA to reduce errors. The “job aid” prepared by NANPA to assist carriers will be discussed at the meeting. The revisions proposed by NANPA have been submitted to the Commission, and the FCC has submitted the forms to OMB for approval. Bill Adair, SBC, questioned whether changes will impact carriers’ ability to meet the February deadline. John Manning advised that NANPA offered simple modifications because it shares the concern that forms are not changed in a way that will impact the database that is used to receive data in the expected format. He advised that the modifications do not impact carriers’ ability to complete the form. Paul Hart, USTA, questioned whether the industry can be advised about the specific modifications that were made. John Manning advised that he intends to walk through the modifications at the December meeting. Bill Adair indicated that any change to the excel spreadsheet impacts SBC’s interface software. Peter Guggina, WorldCom, stated that potential changes do not present a problem, but suggests an additional month may be needed to put together the data. NANPA will provide a copy of the pending forms and job aid, but is concerned that carriers do not confuse pending forms with current forms. Norm Epstein, INC, advised that INC intends to submit a proposed revision to the forms that will require pooling carriers to present monthly forecast data for the first year of their five-year forecast. Bill Adair requested clarification on the purpose of the December 1 meeting. Chairman Hoffman clarified that the OMB process is designed to examine confidentiality, paperwork reduction, and Administrative Procedures Act issues. He suggested that substantive changes should be addressed to the FCC.

CO Code suspensions. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA has been unable to deny numbering resources based on the September filings until October-November and is now denying resources to carriers that do not have a valid NRUF form on file. He reviewed the common reasons that applications have been suspended, and reported that NANPA is tracking the number of suspension based on carriers’ failure to have an NRUF on file. There were 375 suspension the first two weeks of November and approximately 100

suspensions over the last week and a half. David Bench, Nortel Networks, inquired as to whether a manual process is used to check whether a carrier has an NRUF on file. John Manning advised that the process is not manual. Mr. Bench noted that the industry is looking at expanding the LERG to allow viewing of all associated OCNs, which may be helpful to verify whether carriers have an NRUF on file. Jim Castagna, Verizon, requested clarification on the criteria that is used to determine the validity of carriers' forecast data. Mr. Manning advised that carriers who request large volumes are questioned and that NANPA checks for anomalies and inconsistencies. Bill Adair questioned whether carriers are first notified of errors when they file applications for resources. John Manning advised that NANPA worked with carriers who submitted erroneous NRUF forms that would be the basis for denying resources to give the carriers an opportunity to correct the NRUF form before request for numbering resources is denied.

Mr. Manning advised that NANPA is in the process of providing NRUF data to the states that have indicated that they have appropriate confidentiality protections in place – 16 states to date.

#### Reclamation process.

Mr. Manning reported that states are discovering that carrier contact information on CO code applications is outdated. States need contact information in order to follow through on questions for the reclamation process. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, noted that the New Hampshire commission is trying to work with carriers to clarify questions during the reclamation process, and inquired as to the consequences for not keeping contact information up to date. Beth Kistner, ALTS, noted that she is not aware of a process that requires carriers to update this information. John Manning noted that the current process is reactive rather than proactive, and agreed to further research how to best address this issue. Terry Monroe, CompTel, advised that penalties may not be the answer, and suggested that an email distribution be sent periodically to request carriers to update contact information. He volunteered to assist with getting updated contact information. David Bench pointed out that NIIF maintains an updated directory on its web page. Switson Wigfall, NARUC, noted that the North Carolina commission experienced difficulty maintaining current contact information and tried to reconcile its regulatory contact list with the NANPA contact list.

Performance survey. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA inadvertently used information from its internal performance survey in a public forum and is committed to insuring that it does not happen again. The survey is intended as an internal measurement tool for NANPA.

Loretta Lynch, NARUC, indicated that the California commission intends to resolve the issue of getting up to date contact information if the NANC does not resolve it. Beth Kistner suggested that a process be developed to update contact information. Ron Havens, Sprint, advised that his company designates a single contact person and that designated person is responsible for finding the responsible person in the company to address the matter. Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO, noted that contact information will

always be an issue. He suggested that it is a state issue and should be left to the states to resolve. Chairman Hoffman inquired as to the best way to coordinate the issue. Terry Monroe, suggested that NANPA, states, and NIIF can get together to coordinate directories. John Manning stated that he would like to further discuss the matter with the NANPA reclamation group to explore possible solutions for updating contact information.

***NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report.*** Pat Caldwell, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Caldwell reviewed the draft 2000 NANPA performance survey. Several edits were suggested to questions 3, 13, and 20. The NANC agreed to eliminate the reference to “industry” in question 3. Questions 13 and 20 were revised to include a reference to “state delegated authority.” John Manning pointed out that section 4, items a through c, do not allow the respondent to evaluate NANPA’s performance. Pat Caldwell advised that the section is not intended to evaluate NANPA performance but to gauge the transition from COCUS to NRUF. NANC agreed to eliminate section 4 since it does not evaluate NANPA’s performance. Beth O’Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether respondents’ contact information will be passed along to NANPA. Pat Caldwell advised that the responses, including the contact information, would be shared with NANPA. Beth Kistner expressed concern that attribution will chill comments. Mr. Caldwell explained that the NOWG considered this issue in past surveys and decided that information should not be submitted anonymously. Peter Guggina emphasized that it is important to identify a contact person, especially if the feedback is negative. He suggests that requiring contact information will lead to more honest responses. Mr. Guggina inquired as to the number of surveys that will be accepted from each entity. Mr. Caldwell explained that each entity decides how many to submit, and he noted that the quantity submitted by each entity will not skew the survey results because the evaluation is no longer based on a numeric value. Rather, the evaluation is based on “highs” and “lows.”

NANPA Technical requirements. A meeting is scheduled in December to review the workplan for developing the technical requirements for the next NANPA contract. Technical requirements will be presented to NANC in May or June 2001. Peter Guggina suggested that the NOWG develop a timeline and critical elements for the NANC’s review. He also suggested that the NOWG get input from the Legal Expertise Working Group.

Beth O’Donnell questioned whether NANPA’s definition of “consensus” should be reviewed by the NOWG. John Manning explained that the relief planners are working with the NOWG to develop consensus definitions based on the INC guidelines and CLC definitions.

Leadership changes. Karen Mulberry will no longer serve as co-chair. Pat Caldwell will serve as Chair. Eleanor Willis-Camara, WinStar, and Rose Breidenbaugh, USTA, will provide additional leadership support as needed

***D. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group Report.***

Eleanor Willis-Camara, Co-Chair provided the report to the Council. Ms. Willis-Camara reported that Brian Baldwin has retired from SBC and will no longer co-chair the NRO WG. The NRO WG does not have a recommendation for a co-chair replacement at this time.

COCUS Requirements Document. The NRO WG submitted text for inclusion in the Pooling Administration (PA) Requirements Document regarding COCUS/NRUF data collection. Jim Castagna, Verizon, expressed concern with the proposed addendum as well as its consistency with the COCUS Requirements Document. He suggested that either the PA IMG or the NANC review the document for consistency. Peter Guggina questioned whether the FCC RFP process allows time for the PA IMG to review the proposed addendum and report back to NANC. Chairman Hoffman suggested that NANC could delegate authority to the PA IMG to review the proposal and make changes for submission directly to the FCC. Bill Adair questioned whether the RFP timeline allows for the NANC to give the FCC meaningful feedback on the proposed addendum. Adam Neuman, Telecordia, suggested that most of the pooling administration requirements are already in INC guideline and that it is assumed that CO code requirements should be applied to PA requirements. Ed Gould, AT&T, expressed concern that NANC cannot move forward on the proposed addendum to the PA Requirements Document because of its link to the COCUS Requirements Document, which the NANC needs additional time to review. Chairman Hoffman proposed that NANC review the COCUS Requirements Document and prepare recommendations for the January 2001 NANC meeting. He noted that the same procedure can be followed for the PA addendum, but the NANC runs the risk of the FCC issuing the RFP before the January 2001 NANC meeting. The NRO WG requested comments on the proposed COCUS Requirements Document by December 15, 2000. Peter Guggina suggested that there may be philosophical differences on whether some NRUF data should go to NANPA and some to the Pooling Administrator or all to one entity. Bill Adair agreed that NANC should spend additional time reviewing the proposed PA addendum. Chairman Hoffman noted that even if the FCC is on schedule to issue the RFP before the end of the year it can take official notice of the issue. Norm Epstein noted that NANC previously decided that information should go to both NANPA and the Pooling Administrator, which is reflected in the INC guidelines as a result. NANC agreed to review the COCUS Requirements Document and provide input to the NRO WG by December 15, 2000. NANC also agreed to review the PA Requirements Document and decide whether and what to recommend to the FCC. Peter Guggina noted that COCUS Requirements Document does not specify how states obtain NRUF data.

***E. October 17-18 Meeting Minutes.*** The October 17-18 meeting minutes were approved with minor edits.

***F. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.*** Norm Epstein, Moderator, provided the report to the Council.

NANP Expansion Progress. INC eliminated four NANP expansion options and has reached consensus that there are two viable options remaining. Both require that the D-digit release not occur prior to NANP expansion. D digit release has been endorsed by the Canadian industry. Mr. Epstein reported that there is some interest within the FCC to explore the release of the D-digit to optimize the use of numbering resources. The INC does not endorse release of the D-digit prior to NANP expansion. David Bench pointed out that some toll fraud packages impact release of the D-digit because “0” or “1” in the D-digit will not be recognized as a valid telephone number. He noted that Nortel Network’s October 15, 2000 ex parte lays out the pitfalls of releasing the D-digit apart from NANP expansion. Chairman Hoffman suggested that INC review its current NANP expansion proposals with NANC at the January 2001 meeting.

Growth Central Office (CO) Code Appeals. INC requested clarification on when appeals of NANPA’s denial of growth central office codes go to state commissions or the FCC. Paul Hart suggested that INC identify specific instances when the problem arises. Peter Guggina suggested that INC develop scenarios that the Legal Expertise Working Group can review to determine who to go to in each situation.

Imminent Exhaust Procedures. INC requested clarification on whether criteria for allocating CO codes outside of the rationing process (imminent exhaust procedures) should be developed on an NPA basis or should national standards be developed. Lori Messing, CTIA, pointed out that some efforts have been made around the country to address carriers’ need for numbering resources in imminent exhaust situations. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, agreed with INC that this is not a technical issue for INC to address but that it is a policy decision that has to be made by the FCC or states under delegated authority. She suggested that the issue be brought to the NARUC meeting for further discussion. Ms. Messing explained that wireless carriers supported contributions in approximately seven NPAs, in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York, to address the imminent exhaust problem. She advised that she would have to review the language to assess the differences. Mr. Guggina pointed out that although INC guidelines are technical they provide a means for implementing policy. He agreed that communication at NARUC meeting would be helpful. Chairman Hoffman suggested that CTIA make a presentation to NANC to help NANC understand the arrangements that have been reached by CTIA members. Mr. Gould expressed support of national guidelines.

Unassigned Number Porting(UNP) Report. The INC submitted a report to the FCC on UNP, pursuant to the *NRO First Report and Order*, paragraph 231. The report defines UNP as the transfer of one or more available telephone numbers from one LNP-capable service provider to another LNP-capable service provider to serve the same rate area using Location Routing Number technology. The INC reports that the intent of UNP is two-fold: 1) to fulfill a specific customer request; or 2) to allow a service provider to establish a presence within a rate area (footprint). The report acknowledges that both of these applications rely on the use of numbering resources from another service provider and presume that the request can be met with less than a full NXX or, in a pooled area, less than a thousands-block. UNP is being proposed as an alternative method of obtaining numbering resources even if full NXXs or thousands-blocks are available from

the NANPA or PA, respectively. The INC presented three approaches to UNP – UNP without an administrator, UNP with a minimal administrative structure, and UNP with an administrator.

**G. Toll Free Issue Management Group (IMG).** Ron Havens, Chair, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Havens reported that the IMG continues to be at an impasse on the competitive bid issue. Because of the time devoted to trying to achieve a consensus on the competitive issue, the IMG has been unable to focus on the technical requirements document and requests an extension until March 30, 2001. Chairman Hoffman proposed that the NANC relieve the IMG of its obligation to reach a consensus on the competitive bid issue. He suggested that the NANC ask the FCC for an extension and explain why NANC is unable to meet the deadline. Jim Castagna explained that contributions to the technical requirements have been made, but the IMG's review has not been completed. Peter Guggina noted that failure to meet deadline has more to do with competitors working at cross-purposes and that efforts to reach a consensus on the competitive bid issue sidetracked the IMG.

**H. NIIF Report on Issue #0173 - Toll free record application performance guidelines.** Dave Bench provided the report to the Council. He provided a description of the issue before NIIF as follows:

There are currently no established industry guidelines for measuring the overall performance for the updating and flow of toll free records from the RESPOG through the SMS/800 Database (DB) to the SCP DB back through the SCP DB through the SMS 800 DB to the RESPOG. There are no unified benchmark documents, end-to-end system demonstrated measurements to ensure quality, and no documented Level of Service Agreements by which to monitor end-to-end system performance. System congestion has increased with the advent of new codes, increases in NPA Splits, system functionality changes, record complexity, and the number of partitions within the SMS/800 database.

Mr. Bench presented the NIIF suggested resolution and the status of planned activities. He explained that initial closure of this issue is expected before the January 2001 NANC meeting.

**I. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.** Co-Chairs Charles Ryburn and Brian Egbert provided updates to the Council.

Mr. Egbert reviewed the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNPSC) activities. He reported that NeuStar presented an overview to the WNPSC of long and short timers, business days and business hours describing both the current values and the tunable NPAC values, as well as Sunday maintenance windows. Given the current values and capabilities, an opportunity may exist for Sunday porting. A draft mission, scope, and responsibilities were developed to facilitate an initial Wireless Operations Team meeting. The Wireless Demand Model assumptions were updated and the resulting transactions/second requirements calculated for the LLC Exhibit N. The status report issues matrix was updated to include additional work plan items. At OBF #72, the

Alternate Billing Issue was accepted. NENA submitted two additional 911 test scripts to be included in the Intercarrier Test Plan. Anna Miller announced her resignation as co-chair after the December meeting. Nominations for co-chair should be submitted at the December LNPA WG meeting. After the holiday season, the Wireless Operations Team should evaluate the need for Sunday porting. An initial kick-off meeting of the Wireless Operations Team is targeted for February 15, 2001, after the LNPA WG meeting. The updated Wireless Demand Model was distributed to the LNPA WG and will be updated in February, after the holiday season, and quarterly thereafter, per the Exhibit N schedule. At OBF #73, the Directory Listing issue will be presented. NENA has a wireless LNP 911 study group that is addressing PSAP requirements during mixed service periods.

3<sup>rd</sup> Wireline/Wireless Integration Report. Mr. Ryburn presented updates to the open issues from the October NANC meeting (rate center, directory and billing issues). He explained that the rate center issue was referred to the NANC and subsequently to the FCC in February 1998. The directory listings issue will be discussed as part of OBF #73 in January 2001. The billing issue has been referred to T1S1 and is currently addressed in TR 45.2. The alternate billing issue was accepted by the OBF at OBF #72.

NPAC/SMS Release Status. Mr. Ryburn reported that the Northeast Region group testing began on November 6, 2000 and is 78% complete. Super Region group testing began November 13, 2000 and is 31% complete. A second phase of Super Region group testing is scheduled for December 4, 2000 for the service providers that are still completing individual TUT. NeuStar is expected to have a new SOW for release 4.0 in December, and the LNPA WG continues to work on requirements for release 5.0 change orders.

Problem Identification Management (PIM). PIM 5 – Inadvertent Porting. In response to a request by the LLC, Steven Addicks, LNPA co-chair, is developing scenarios to address situations in which a customer might be inadvertently ported (e.g., when a typo causes the wrong telephone number to be ported). PIM 8 – Telephone numbers get ported from a specific JIP with the incorrect LRN which route customer to wrong receiving office. When the author of the problem description was contacted to get clarification on the problem, one of the LNPA WG co-chairs was able to explain how to resolve the problem with existing LNP information, resources, and processes. This PIM will be closed.

Slow Horse. Subcommittee members hold widely divergent views on LSMS performance requirements. Written proposals have been requested.

Ed Gould questioned whether Sunday porting is a wireless issue. Charles Ryburn advised that it has been discussed in all porting venues. Beth O'Donnell requested clarification on the directory listing issue. Mr. Ryburn advised that it concerns how to publish wireless telephone number once it becomes a wireline number. Lori Messing, presented CTIA's minority opinion on the LNPAWG 3<sup>rd</sup> Wireless Wireline Integration Report. She explained that the wireless industry has established 2.5 hour porting

intervals between wireless carriers and the 3-4 day porting interval between wireline and wireless carriers should be reduced. The CTIA opinion will be attached as Appendix D to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wireline-Wireless Integration Report. The NARUC statement in support of reducing the porting intervals will be attached as Appendix E. Chairman Hoffman asked Mr. Ryburn to draft a cover letter transmitting the report to the CCB.

**J. Cost Recovery Working Group (CR WG) Report.** Anne La Lena provided the report to the Council. Work is underway on the new requirements document for the billing and collection (B&C) agent. The CR WG expects to submit its report to NANC next year. It will assume that the B&C agent will bill and collect funds for both PA and NANPA functions, as is currently done.

***Wednesday, November 29, 2000***

**K.** The Council reviewed and approved the transmittal letter for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wireless/Wireline Integration report.

**L.** NANC reviewed and approved the letter to the CCB requesting an extension until March 2001 to complete its recommendation on toll free administration.

**M. Steering Group Report.** Peter Pescosolido, NARUC, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Pescosolido reported that Phil McClelland, NASUCA, presented an outline to address “big picture” issues related to NANP exhaust. The Council reviewed the outline and it was agreed that the outline will be edited based on the comments received. The outline will be recirculated to the Steering Group and discussed at the January 2001 Steering Group meeting. It will be presented to the full NANC for discussion at the February and March 2001 meetings. Chairman Hoffman explained that delaying the full NANC discussion to the February and March 2001 meetings allows time to re-examine the INC NANP expansion recommendations, which have been narrowed. Bill Adair agreed that it is valuable to begin an ongoing educational process in January 2001. Peter Guggina agreed and volunteered to work on contributions to further the work begun by Mr. McClelland. Trent Boaldin suggested that NANC not “replow” already worked by the industry. Peter Guggina recommended that any past work on the issues be reanalyzed to get a fresh perspective in light of current conditions. Paul Hart recommended that principles be established up front.

Rose Briedenbaugh reviewed the revised Table of NANC projects.

**N. Carrier Identification Codes (CICs) IMG Report.** Bill Adair, Chair, provided the report to the Council. The IMG held a meeting on November 8, 2000 to review the directive from the Common Carrier Bureau. It is on target to complete the report by March 2001, but is still looking for participation from the reseller community. Courtney Jackson, OUR, questioned whether there will be a change in the administration of CICs. Mr. Adair advised no. Julie Peterson, SBC, explained that the IMG is focused on the tasks assigned and will not address the soft-slammings problem generally.

**O. NBANC Report.** John Ricker provided the report to the Council. He reviewed the fund balance, and advised that NBANC is awaiting FCC approval to pay PricewaterhouseCoopers for additional audit expenses.

**P. Limited Liability Corporation (LLCs) NPAC Report.** No report.

**Q. Meeting Procedures IMG.** Beth Kistner, chair, provided the report. Ms. Kistner advised that the draft meeting procedures are near completion. They will be circulated via email in the next few weeks, and she expects to present them at the January 2001 NANC meeting.

**R. Approval of October 17-18, 2000 Meeting Minutes.** The minutes were approved.

**S. Other Business.** None.

**T. Next Meeting.** January 16-17, 2001.

**VI. Action Items and Decisions Reached:**

1. NANPA Report. NANPA will go to its Reclamation Group to determine what options are available or can be developed to keep contact information lists up to date. NANPA will report on this matter at the January 16-17, 2001 NANC meeting. NANPA will provide updates electronically as information becomes available.

2. NANPA Oversight Working Group. NANPA annual performance survey, add phrase "state delegated authority" in questions 13 and 20 of the survey form. In question 3, strike "industry" change COCUS to COCUS/NRUF in question 19. Strike section 4. NOWG is authorized to proceed with survey changes. Leadership arrangements accepted – Pat Caldwell will remain as Chair with leadership support to be provided by Rose Breidenbaugh, USTA and Eleanor Willis Camara, WinStar.

NANPA Technical Requirements. A detailed report will be provided at the January 2001 meeting.

Definition of consensus with regard to relief planning process -- NOWG was assigned to work with NANPA to adopt appropriate definition and to come back to NANC if problems develop.

3. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group. The NRO WG will operate with two co-chairs. All NANC members should review the NRUF requirements document and be prepared at the January 16-17, 2001 meeting to discuss revisions. Any changes should be submitted to the NRO co-chairs before the December 15, 2000 NRO WG meeting. Review proposed addendum and determine if necessary or obviated by INC guidelines at the January 2001 NANC meeting.

4. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. Norm Epstein will make a presentation at the January NANC meeting on the six NANP expansion options to understand why four options were rejected by INC.

CTIA will make a presentation on imminent exhaust procedures and accommodations among carriers. The briefing will discuss agreements among carriers in three states.

5. Cost Recovery Working Group Report. The CRWG is to proceed with the assumption that the B&C agent will bill and collect funds for both the Pooling Administrator as well as the NANPA. The billing and collections requirements document is a sub-section to be included in a more expansive document with terms and conditions set by the FCC.
6. Toll Free IMG. NANC directed the IMG to proceed as directed with a revised target date of March 2001. A letter to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau was finalized advising that NANC would not be able to provide a recommendation on whether to recommend a competitive bid process and to notify the Commission that the NANC technical requirements recommendation would be delayed until March 2001.
7. Discussion of Expansion Options. The outline will be finalized during the January 16, 2001 Steering Group meeting for discussion at February 21, 2001, NANC meeting.
8. Procedures IMG. The IMG will provide a report and draft recommendation at the January 16-17, 2001 NANC meeting. A draft will be circulated before the end of December.